

Appln No. 09/585,025

Amdt date February 22, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 20, 2004

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-45 and 47-79 are pending. Claims 29-30, 32-33, 36, 41-45, and 52 are amended, and claim 46 is canceled.

Applicants appreciate Examiner's acknowledgement of the August 6, 2003 IDS. However, the Examiner still has not acknowledged receipt of the October 12, 2004 IDS. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request consideration and acknowledgment of the above-mentioned IDS and the IDS currently being filed with this amendment by initialing and returning the attached copies of the same IDSs.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kara (US 5,825,893) in view of Slayden et al (US 5,680,629). Claims 29-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kara in view of Parthesarathy et al. (US 6,353,926). In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 includes, among other limitations, "wherein the printing wizard determines top, center, or bottom offset, and prints a quality assurance VBI without charging the user."

As the Examiner correctly states, Kara does not teach or suggest a printing wizard that "determines top, center, or bottom offset, and prints a quality assurance VBI without charging the user." (Office action, page 3, second paragraph.). However, the Examiner alleges that Slayden teaches a printing

**Appln No. 09/585,025**

**Amdt date February 22, 2005**

**Reply to Office action of October 20, 2004**

wizard that "determines top, center, or bottom offset, and prints a quality assurance VBI without charging the user."

(Office action, page 3, third paragraph.). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Although, the Examiner cites the entire Slayden reference, Applicants believe the most relevant parts in Slayden are FIGs. 12B, 21A, and the related text. FIG. 12B is a flow diagram of the preview facility. The related text states that "steps 1205-1208 of the new application are identical to steps 1201-1204 of the old application, except that besides allowing the user to issue a print document command in 1205, the new application also allows the user to issue a preview document command. If the user issues the preview document command, the application continues at steps 1209-1212 to preview the document." (Col. 8, lines 36-41.). The preview facility design of Slayden allows "the user to print on exit from the preview document stage represents a processing efficiency, since it allows the user to print without repeating the time-consuming step of producing an intermediate version of the document." (Col. 8, lines 63-67.).

As a result, Slayden does not disclose a printing wizard that "prints a quality assurance VBI without charging the user." The "print document command" or the "preview document command" do not constitute printing "a quality assurance VBI without charging the user." Similarly, the "print on exit" from the preview document stage does not constitute printing "a quality assurance VBI without charging the user." The claimed limitation of printing of "a quality assurance VBI without

**Appln No. 09/585,025**

**Amdt date February 22, 2005**

**Reply to Office action of October 20, 2004**

charging the user" solves a different problem than Slayden's preview window and "print document command."

Additionally, Slayden does not disclose a printing wizard that "determines top, center, or bottom offset" [for printing the VBI]. The offset determination steps of FIG. 21A of Slayden are not offsets for printing. These offsets are calculated for drawing each element that intersects with a paint rectangle in the preview window, and not for printing. (Col. 17, lines 44-52). The claimed limitation of printing of determining "top, center, or bottom offset" solves a different problem than Slayden's calculated offsets for drawing elements in the paint rectangle. Consequently, independent claim 1 is patentable over Kara and Slayden.

Amended independent claim 29 includes, among other limitations, "a printing wizard including a first GUI for printing a sample print including a symbol, and a second GUI for displaying a plurality of symbols for a user to select one of the displayed plurality of symbols matching the symbol printed on the sample print and based on the selected symbol, determining a print offset."

As discussed above, Kara does not disclose the above-mentioned limitation. The software installation and screen prompts of FIG. 2 and related text in Kara do not describe the above-mentioned limitation recited in claim 29. Similarly, Parthesarathy does not disclose, nor does it suggest the above-mentioned limitation. Therefore, independent claim 29 is also patentable over the cited references.

**Appln No. 09/585,025**

**Amdt date February 22, 2005**

**Reply to Office action of October 20, 2004**

Amended independent claim 52 includes, among other limitations, "logging into the server system from a second computer by the user; identifying that the user is using the second computer; validating the user from the second computer; and authorizing the user from the second computer to print the VBI."

As explained above, the software installation and screen prompts of FIG. 2 and related text in Kara do not disclose the above limitations. Likewise, Parthesarathy does not disclose, nor does it suggest the above-mentioned limitation. Consequently, independent claim 52 is also patentable over the cited references.

In short, independent claims 1, 29 and 52 are patentable over the cited references. Dependent claims 2-28, 30-51 and 53-79 all depend, directly or indirectly, from their respective independent claims. Therefore, these claims are also patentable over the cited references, as being dependent from allowable independent claims 1, 29 and 52, and for the additional limitations they include therein.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Raymond R. Tabandeh  
Reg. No. 43,945  
626/795-9900

RRT/mee  
MEE PAS609682.1--02/22/05 5:28 PM